

# Groundwater Management Plan Committee

December 14, 2017

12pm – 2pm at Festival Hall Rm 1

## Committee Members in attendance:

Brent Hunter	Rob Dotson
Paul Cozzens	Paul Nelson
Reed Erickson	Paul Monroe

## Items of Discussion

### 1. Review Minutes:

Motion to approve the minutes by Rob Dotson Second by Reed Erickson

### 2. *Review the Groundwater Management Plan Draft*

Paul Monroe put together a draft plan that was passed out to the public in attendance as well as the committee members. Rob Dotson began the review of the draft. He stated that the plan is an overall picture of what we will be doing to monitor the water in Cedar Valley.

Brent Hunter asked if at the time that the State Engineer begins to remove access to water rights would it be based on acre-feet or by the acre. Brent gave an example, of his farm where he is required to have 4 ac/ft per acre of water but is only using 2 ac/ft to irrigate with.

Dotson answered saying it would be based on acre-feet.

Monroe said the SE looks at the conserved amount being equal to the return flow amount which would have made it back into the aquifer if we were still flood irrigating. Based on the policy as it is, they will restrict water based on acreage.

Paul Monroe and Brent Hunter both commented that it is not in our best interest to adjust the duty.

Rob Dotson stated that the whole intent of Goal A#1. Is for each entity to figure it out for themselves, to assist the State Engineer to use the measurement tools we have. Water rights, usage, and the local hydrology. He said that it is his duty as a representative of his area to help gather this data and make sure it is as accurate as possible.

### *Agricultural Incentive Conservation Update*

Water for agriculture uses 75% of the water in the basin. There was short discussion about the conservation measures that Brent Hunter had used in conjunction with USU by installing low elevation spray application (LESA) bubblers to his pivot.

Paul Monroe stated that one area that we will have to really talk to the SE about is how much of a difference conservation makes. In our basin we are the downstream user, so what we don't take out of the ground, is water that is saved for us. 12:46pm

### *Section B Importation of Water Goals & Policy: 12:49pm*

The goals listed in this draft on page #4 are based on the goals of the District. The policies on page #5 (B-1.1) Discussion on what the future policies will be as far as water rights, and how they are utilized by the property owner or developers. Reed Erickson suggested adding that municipalities and entities have a universal formal plan about how we are going to move forward with development and water rights. Russell Reber (public attendant) wanted to comment on his fears as a developer where the water rights are concerned.

Discussion on importation of water from the West Desert lasts for several minutes on the delivery options of importing water.

One option for senior water right holders who subscribe to the imported water they could get banked credit for water recharged. Junior water right holders who want to continue to use their existing well and infrastructure, must pay a subscriber's fee.

### *Section C-Paul Bittman-Reuse of treated wastewater:*

Cedar City is looking into doing further studies on how best to utilize this water. Paul Cozzens said that there are five or six options on the table, and stated that no matter what is done they know they are going to have to install a sand filter. The sand filter will take the water to type #1 water which could be used in a pivot, or recharge, but not quite safe enough to drink.

Cozzens believes that the lowest hanging fruit is to run the line straight down 2300 W and pump that water into the Enoch Graben. Let the farmers use it, and keep them from pumping water out of our aquifer. Cozzens also believes that this idea is the best sell, because Cedar City is using as much water out of the Enoch area as Enoch City. Rob Dotson said that another idea that would be financially feasible would be to pump it over by the gravel pits by the freeway.

### *Artificial Recharge of Surface Water Paul Cozzens:*

Cozzens asked what the best way to put this information together is. Monroe stated that he would definitely help. In moving forward, the main thing to think about is how are we going to record and report. How are we going to set up monitoring in that area? Do we need to set up more monitoring wells, or just get the USGS on board? We

need to have a boarder network of wells. Hunter agreed to getting the USGS on board. The committee all agreed in the need for good data.

There was brief discussion on the removal of the Highway 56 boundary line and that it would do more harm than benefit.

*Water Conservation Paul Monroe & Brent Hunter*

Brent Hunter contacted the Power Company. The Power Company said that they will help individual farmers put in these conservation systems, because of the savings in power. Erickson stated that Evan Vickers was at a meeting and said that they would really like to help find funding for these systems but are concerned that they won't be able to find additional funding.

Rob Dotson asked if there were other states that had these types of projects in place that we could look to as an example. This way we would have some further direction to give to Vickers and Westwood so they could move forward trying to find funding.

1:30pm

3. Next Meeting Date

- a. January 11, 2018 Festival Hall Room #1

Motion to adjourn by Brent Hunter Second By Paul Cozzens. 1:33PM